

**COUNTY COUNCIL –22 March 2017
PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

<p>1. Questioner's name: Martin Large</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p>
<p><i>The official minutes from the Extraordinary meeting of the County Council on 18th February 2015 where Labour councillors motioned to cancel the Javelin Park contract state that:</i></p> <p><i>1. "advice from officers was that it would cost between £60 million-£100 million to cancel the contract"</i></p> <p><i>2. [Cllr Theodoulou said Javelin Park] "would provide £150 million worth of savings"</i></p> <p>Are these figures factually accurate, given what the recently uncovered UBB Contract tells us..and if not accurate, can the Labour motion to cancel be debated again?</p>	<p>I am happy to confirm that these figures were accurate at the time, although, with subsequent construction etc, the cost of breaking the contract now may have increased.</p>
<p>2. Questioner's name: Jojo Mehta</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p>
<p>To: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p> <p><i>Noting that at the Extraordinary meeting of the County Council on 18th February 2015 during discussion of the motion to cancel the Javelin Park incinerator contract, the Council was informed that "advice from [Council] officers was that it would cost between £60 million-£100 million to cancel the contract";</i></p> <p><i>noting further that Councillor Ray Theodoulou, opposing the motion, stated that the contract "would provide £150 million worth of savings [3] and ... these were challenging times with savings of £75 million needing to be found by the Council over the next 3 years";</i></p>	<p>We have always been very clear that savings are over the life of the contract. As we also made clear at the time, the costs for cancellation set out in the contract do not include the others costs the council would have to bear, including financing costs, extra waste disposal costs, and re-procurement costs. The Council has acted appropriately and legally.</p>

noting further that the Leader of the Council Mark Hawthorne summed up opposition to the motion in this way: "*a simple choice between £150 million of savings or cancelling the contract and incurring up to a £100 million in costs*";

noting that analysis of the unredacted Javelin Park contract now shows those figures to have been substantially exaggerated and that any savings would certainly not materialise within 3 years, and

noting that the motion to cancel was lost;

given that the officers referred to were familiar with the contract and knew or should have known that the figures they provided were grossly misleading to the Council as a whole (which did not at the time have access to that information), and

given that, as specified in the background section to the recent Tribunal judgment, this information "was relied on at the meeting by those in favour of continuing with the project",

can the Leader of the Council tell me whether the loss of that motion can be challenged and justify his response with specific reference to the Council's constitution?

3. Questioner's name: Rachel Smith

Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou

Given the recent Information Tribunal ruling, and the clear public interest in knowing the deals the authority is doing with taxpayers money, what steps will the Council now take to implement an open contracting policy, with proactive publication of all council contracts?

The Council has agreed to set up a cross-party working group to look into open contracting. I am sure that any findings will be closely examined by the whole council.

<p>4. Questioner's name: Gerald Hartley</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p>
<p>In answer to my question on February 15th asking whether Cllr Theodoulou would commit to fully supporting the waste collection authorities to convert residual waste to recycle, he said, "the County Council encouraged collection agencies to do more through discussions within the Joint Waste Committee.</p> <p>Can he explain how Stroud DC, which is not a member of the JWC, sends the least amount of waste per capita to landfill of all the County's WCA's and will he prompt the JWC to take lessons from Stroud to save us all a fortune in gate fees?</p>	<p>You can view details of the membership of the committee on the county council's website.</p>
<p>5. Questioner's name: Gerald Hartley</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p>
<p>Does Cllr Theodoulou understand that if all Glos WCA's matched Stroud's performance, there would only be 70,000 tonnes pa for delivery to landfill now and to the MBI in future and can he confirm that the economic viability of the CC's EfW contract would then be in question and depend on the value of electricity produced from burning 120,000 tonnes pa of commercial and industrial waste.</p>	<p>I welcome Stroud's improved collections – which is something the County Council has been calling for for some time, and which we have, in respect of food waste collections, provided money to support. I would await full-year figures before drawing too many conclusions.</p> <p>I would, however, note that Stroud is the last district in Gloucestershire to adopt this approach to collection. In other words, other WCAs already take the same approach as Stroud, in many cases without achieving the same reductions in waste. This is particularly the case with more urban areas.</p> <p>Even with Stroud's improved rates, we forecast over 142,000 tonnes of residual waste will be produced in Gloucestershire this year. As we have stated consistently, if the county cannot deliver significant levels of recycling, the plant risks being too small.</p>

6. Questioner's name: Gerald Hartley	Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou
Given the Tribunal's judgement on the CC's appeal against the Information Commissioner's decision that the business case and contract be publicly available with few exceptions, will the County Council be seeking financial redress from its legal advisors and/or UBB; or will the cost be written off to afford redress to UBB for the CC's failure to secure a redacted version of the contract on its own website.	The costs of the appeal were previously provided for within the budget approved by Council.
7. Questioner's name: Gerald Hartley	Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou
Can Cllr Theodoulou explain why, when the CC received a FoI request to release the contract and business case, the CC chose to ignore Schedule 23 of the contract which listed the elements to be kept confidential, in favour of redacting even more of it.	As the council explained to the tribunal, this was not accepted as an exhaustive list.
8. Questioner's name: Gerald Hartley	Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou
Can Cllr Theodoulou state the cabinet's official view of the Local Government Transparency Code and can he explain their ignoring of its specific advice in relation to the EfW contract.	Please see the answer to question 3
9. Questioner's name: David Willingham	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
To: Cllr Vernon Smith In June 2016, a constituent attempted to report to GCC a problem with the electricity supply pillar for the speed camera close to St Peter's Church on Tewkesbury Road, Cheltenham. Their concern was that due to the pillar falling over and mains wiring being visible, there was a risk that live mains was exposed just inside the pillar.	The Electrical Supply Pillar associated with the Speed Camera was investigated by Gloucestershire County Council and Western Power from an early stage And posed no risk to the public. The pillar was inspected, the cables exposed posed no risk of electrical shock and the leaning feeder pillar was fenced off from an early stage to ensure the public did not enter the area.

<p>Their reports to GCC were initially not acted upon, after further contact with GCC they were then misdirected by GCC to the Police, still concerned at the lack of action by GCC they escalated the issue to councillors and the PCC, whose representations still resulted in no action by GCC, and it was only when the Gloucestershire Echo were told of the issue and photographed it in December 2016 that repairs were eventually made.</p> <p>Does the Cabinet Member share my concerns about the way this issue was mishandled and the unnecessary risk to the public caused by the excessive delay in making it safe</p>	
<p>10. Questioner's name: David Willingham</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Robbins</p>
<p>Will the Audit and Governance Committee consider including a review of the concerns this raises, such as tracking asset ownership, the lack of an identified maintenance budget for the equipment, and the communications problems between subcontractors, into the work programme of that Committee in the forthcoming municipal year?</p>	<p>That will be for the Committee to determine after the May elections.</p>
<p>11. Questioner's name: David Willingham</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>To: Cllr Vernon Smith</p> <p>In August 2016, following representations from Cheltenham's Hackney Carriage trade, GCC were requested to move an incorrectly located "Queue Here" sign associated with the Taxi Rank on the Promenade, Cheltenham. In February 2017, with one month's notice, GCC were again asked to relocate this sign, to avoid it causing confusion and possible conflict during Cheltenham Race Week. On the evening of 14th March 2017, during Cheltenham Race Week, this incorrectly located sign was still in situ, and was witnessed causing problems and confusion to visitors</p>	<p>The sign was relocated to the new location, in accordance with communication with both Councillor Willingham and the CBC licensing authority, on 11th March 2017.</p>

<p>to the town. Could the Cabinet Member for Highways please explain why despite repeated requests from both CBC Officers and councillors, including one with a clearly defined and necessary deadline of 13th March 2017, neither GCC nor its subcontractors have been able to relocate, cover or remove the incorrectly sited "Queue Here" sign associated with this Taxi Rank?</p>	
<p>12. Questioner's name: David Willingham</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>To: Cllr Vernon Smith</p> <p>I have been verbally advised by Officers from the County Council that highway surface remodelling works would be performed this municipal year to try to alleviate the nuisance caused by standing water that gathers on Alstone Lane and makes it difficult for some residents to leave their property following rainfall without the risk of being soaked by passing vehicles. Could the Cabinet Member please advise whether this work has been scheduled, and if so whether it will be completed in this municipal year?</p>	<p>Design work has been completed to reprofile the carriageway and move surface water to a nearby drain. Works have been commissioned and will be programmed as soon as resources are available.</p>
<p>13. Questioner's name: David Willingham</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>To: Cllr Vernon Smith</p> <p>At the last meeting of the County Council, numerous residents from St Peter's ward in Cheltenham raised issues about the proposed implementation of the Cheltenham Westend Parking Zone. Could the Cabinet Member please explain why decisions about this TRO that affected so many people in Cheltenham were not the subject of a public meeting of the Traffic Regulation committee?</p>	<p>The answer to this question is covered on page 65 of the TRO report for the parking zone, which is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>In summary, it was considered that, due to the extensive involvement at the consultation stage of elected members for both the County and Borough Councils, senior officers of both councils and interested parties such as the Cheltenham Development Task Force, and the Chamber of Commerce; and since the scheme is designed to realise Local Transport Plan policy commitments that were subject to a Cabinet Decision, and approved by the full Council, following thorough consultation with key partners and the public; further consideration by the Traffic Regulation Committee was unlikely to improve understanding of the key issues relating to the scheme, and was therefore unnecessary.</p>

14. Questioner's name: David Willingham	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>Could the Cabinet Member for Highways please advise how cycling user groups have or will be properly consulted about the proposals to implement a TTRO closing the lower part of the crawler lane on the A435 Cirencester Road, a proposal that is currently highly dangerous because lacks safe cycling provision?</p>	<p>The consultation carried out in January 2017 included the statutory consultees of the Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Cycle Campaign. In addition, the proposals were considered by the Road Safety Hub who will consider the impact on all user groups including cyclists.</p> <p>I have responded more substantially on this issue in my reply to question 17.</p>
15. Questioner's name: David Willingham	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>To: Cllr Vernon Smith</p> <p>Does the Cabinet Member for Highways agree with me that the most likely outcome of a collision involving a cyclist ascending the A435 Cirencester Road being hit from behind by a motor vehicle travelling at the current speed limit of 60mph, is going to be a dead cyclist; and that the County Council's failure to incorporate safe cycling facilities into the proposed TTRO on this popular cycling route from Cheltenham into the Cotswolds will significantly increase the risk of such a fatal collision occurring?</p>	<p>There is no indication of a particular danger on this road- but of course we are always keen to minimise risks where possible.</p>
16. Questioner's name: David Willingham	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>Could the Cabinet Member for Highways please explain why Highways Officers ignored emailed requests from councillors from both the County Council and Cheltenham Borough Council, to be invited to any site visit that would be held to consider the TTRO proposals for the A435 Cirencester Road crawler lane, and proceeded to hold a site visit without inviting councillors who, following consultation by GCC, had expressed their concerns about the safety of the proposed scheme?</p>	<p>I understand there hasn't been an appropriate opportunity to do so.</p>

17. Questioner's name: David Willingham	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>To: Cllr Vernon Smith</p> <p>In correspondence to councillors about the lack of any safe cycling provision in the current TTRO proposals for the A435 Cirencester Road crawler lane, Officers have stated that modifications to incorporate safe cycling provision would cost £30,000, but they are not willing or able to spend this amount to protect one of the most vulnerable groups of road user. Given that 17 years ago, the cost to society of a fatal traffic collision was estimated to be over £1M, which would give a BCR of over 33 if the inclusion of safe cycling provision prevented a single fatal collision, could the Cabinet Member for highways please explain why the County Council doesn't think that the life of a cyclist is worth £30,000?</p>	<p>I am sorry to hear about the difficulties that you have had in raising your concerns with the council. Please accept my apologies for them. I want us to look again more closely at what we can do to protect cyclists during this scheme, and I will ask Nigel Riglar, our Commissioning Director for Infrastructure to meet with you to discuss what alterations we can make.</p>
18. Questioner's name: David Willingham	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>To: Cllr Vernon Smith</p> <p>Will the Cabinet Member for Highways instruct his Officers to reconsider the current TTRO proposals for the A435 Cirencester Road crawler lane and ensure that they are modified to include safe cycling provisions in them?</p>	<p>The TRO process is complete, but I think we can address some of the concerns here effectively through less formal action.</p>
19. Questioner's name: David Willingham	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>To: Cllr Vernon Smith</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member for Highways please advise what co-ordination is in place between the County Council's Parking Services and its contractors responsible for clearing highway drains, to facilitate temporary parking restrictions being put in place to allow blocked drains to be cleared, if repeated attempts at this important flood prevention activity cannot be completed by other means due to parked vehicles always being present?</p>	<p>As part of our programmed cyclical gully emptying several attempts are made, at differing times of day, to access gullies which are covered by parked vehicles on the initial visit. Where continuing difficulties exist then further measures are arranged, either with local residents, through local councillors or with the provision of parking cones to facilitate access. In the urban areas we also work closely with CBC and Glos City to try to co-ordinate, where feasible, with their street cleansing schedule.</p>

20. Questioner's name: Ian Richens

Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou

Please can Cllr Theodoulou explain how he can claim in the Council's press release that the Tribunal upheld the Council's Waste contract appeal when HH Judge Shanks has stated the following in the Decision Statement:

Para 73

Mr Mawdsley's evidence was.... So far reaching as to be unconvincing.

Para 217

The overall result is that, with some notable exceptions which we have set out in the Schedule to the substituted decision above, we have reached the view that Annex 4 and the redacted provisions in the Contract ought to have been disclosed by the Council in April 2015.

Para 219

Notwithstanding that we have rejected the Council and UBB's case to a great extent we wish to thank Mr Mawdsley and Mr Peiro.

To my simple mind the conclusion is a resounding rejection of the Council's attempt to keep the Contract details secret and the whole effort of the appeal was a huge waste of Public funds

The judgement upholds our appeal, and usefully clarifies the sections of the contract we can publish, and those sections which still need to remain redacted. It also makes clear that certain commercially sensitive elements of the contract are right to remain redacted.

21. Questioner's name: Mr and Mrs M J Griffiths	Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou/ Nigel Riglar
<p>Will this Council confirm that a full Health Impact Assessment will be undertaken of the surrounding area and continually monitoring the surrounds every 5 years over the lifetime of the incinerator in order to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing occupants of land and buildings to avoid an unacceptable level of cumulative air pollution on health, the natural environment or general amenity, from the facility and the adjoining motorway junction and motorway, as per NPPF Para 120, The Waste Management Plan for England, and the Gloucestershire Waste Core Strategy?</p>	<p>The Environment Agency is responsible for the licensing of the Javelin Park site and will ensure that it is appropriately monitored very much more frequently than every five years.</p>

COUNTY COUNCIL –22 March 2017
Members' Questions

<p>1. Questioner's name: Cllr Iain Dobie</p> <p>The GCC budget for 2016-17 included £50,000 for air pollution monitoring in Gloucestershire, the intention being to provide crucial data on a public health threat which has been linked to 40,000 premature deaths in this country every year and which has a particularly damaging effect on the health of vulnerable children and older people. How has this £50k been spent, particularly in Gloucestershire's two main conurbations?</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor</p> <p>We have worked with five schools in Cheltenham, Gloucester and Tewkesbury, drawing upon professional support from the Gloucestershire Pollution Group and engaging a team of nationally-accredited sustainable travel advisers to work with pupils on a curriculum based approach. Pupils have learned about air pollution, taken part in real time air pollution monitoring using advanced mobile equipment, and have engaged in developing school travel plans to reduce car travel to school and increase active travel. To date we have committed £37,000 and have had contributions from the three district councils.</p> <p>We are currently investigating the best way to use remaining funds to assist with future air quality monitoring in partnership with district councils. A more detailed independent report will also be brought to Environment Scrutiny Committee.</p>
<p>2. Questioner's name: Cllr Iain Dobie</p> <p>The first National Clean Air Day is 15 June 2017. What action has been taken by GCC to reduce air pollution in Gloucestershire, for example by encouraging use of cleaner vehicles, in the last twelve months?</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor</p> <p>As Cllr Dobie will be aware, air quality is primarily a district council issue, although we do what we can to support them in their work – which in the past has included measures such as promoting electric vehicles and installing charging points, as well as making it easier to choose walking and cycling.</p> <p>The Government has announced a further round of Air Quality Grants for district councils. In Cllr Dobie's area, I believe the local MP is encouraging Cheltenham Borough Council to seek funding through this route to help address air quality issues, something I understand they have not done previously. The County Council will work with CBC in pursuing this.</p>

3. Questioner's name: Cllr Paul Hodgkinson	Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou
How many buildings including schools under the management of this Council across Gloucestershire contain asbestos?	The Council assumes the presence of asbestos in any building built prior to 2000 – irrespective of whether surveys have identified asbestos there or not. Over 500 properties have been subject to a survey – but without significant structural investigation that cannot entirely confirm its absence, so we always adopt a precautionary approach.
4. Questioner's name: Cllr Paul Hodgkinson	Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou
Asbestos is most hazardous when it is friable. Since 2010, how many instances of exposure to asbestos has been recorded by this Council within a school?	There have been three successful claims for asbestos exposure in schools since 2010. All relate to exposure prior to 2001.
5. Questioner's name: Cllr Paul Hodgkinson	Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou
Damage and deterioration will increase the friability of asbestos-containing materials. Since 2010, how much has this Council spent on removing asbestos that has become friable from a building and in particular a school?	Since 2010, the county council has spent over £820,000 on asbestos removal. The actual spend is likely to be considerably higher, because many capital projects involve removing asbestos, which is not separately recorded within the council's accounts.
6. Questioner's name: Cllr Paul Hodgkinson	Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou
Since 2010, how much has been paid in settlement for claims against the council for exposure to asbestos?	6 claims were submitted, relating to historic asbestos exposure, during the period August 2011 - February 2015, of which three were settled in favour of the claimants. No subsequent claims have been received since then. Settlements have been made totalling £570,940.16 (including legal fees).

<p>7. Questioner's name: Cllr David Brown</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Kathy Williams</p>
<p>To: Cllr Kathy Williams</p> <p>This Council to the end of December 2016 has spent over £400K on implementing and facilitating Electronic Call Monitoring (ECM). Please can the Cabinet Member inform me how much money has been saved so far by this Council as a result of introducing Electronic Call Monitoring for Learning Disabilities?</p>	<p>The Disabilities ECM system implemented automatic payment in July 2015 and the savings to date up until end February has totalled £2,120m across Learning Disability, Physical Disability and Mental Health services.</p>
<p>8. Questioner's name: Cllr David Brown</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Kathy Williams</p>
<p>To: Cllr Kathy Williams</p> <p>Back in September 2016 eleven agencies were being trained in order to implement Electronic Call Monitoring for Older People. Please can the Cabinet Member tell me whether all organisations have now been trained and that Electronic Call Monitoring has now been fully rolled-out for Older People?</p>	<p>The current number of Older People providers using the Electronic Call Monitoring System is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CallConfirmLive monitoring system = 9 • On both CallConfirmLive monitoring system and Finance Manager = 9 <p>There are 10 providers who are still not using the ECM systems but they have an anticipated start date for implementation of May 2017 for CallConfirmLive monitoring and August 2016 for Finance Manager.</p>
<p>9. Questioner's name: Cllr David Brown</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Kathy Williams</p>
<p>To: Cllr Kathy Williams</p> <p>What is the total cost of implementing Electronic Call Monitoring across different sectors of domiciliary care and how much in total is it estimated to save this Council?</p>	<p>The system costs for Disability ECM for the full 3 years of the Contract will be £354,327. The cost of the Disability ECM Officer to administer this system for the 3 year period will be £97.5k.</p> <p>The system has generated savings to date of £2.1m, it is anticipated that it would continue to generate savings of above £500k per annum for the remaining contract term.</p>

	<p>The system costs for the OP ECM for the full 7 years of the Contract will be £808,970. The cost of the 2 OP ECM Officers to administer this system for the 7 year period will be £355.2k.</p> <p>The system is expected to generate savings of 5% of the commissioned value of the Dom Care Contract in addition to the system running costs once fully operational. Savings are predicted to be c £4m based on current package numbers.</p>
<p>10. Questioner's name: Cllr Suzanne Williams</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p>
<p>To: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p> <p>How many complaints has this Council received in the last four financial years of domiciliary care staff failing to attend a scheduled visit at a client's home?</p>	<p>The Council has received the following complaints, over the last four years, about domiciliary care staff failing to attend a scheduled visit at a client's home:</p> <p>2013-14 = 5 2014-5 = 5 2015-16 = 7 2016-17 = 5</p> <p>Given the significant number of visits every day, this is positive. I am very happy to look into any specific cases that Cllr Williams or other councillors might be aware of.</p>
<p>11. Questioner's name: Cllr Suzanne Williams</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p>
<p>To: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p> <p>How many of these complaints failed to attend a scheduled visit more than once at a client's home?</p>	<p>The following amount have failed to attend a scheduled visit more than once at a clients home:</p> <p>2013-14 = 3 more than once 2014-5 = 4 more than once 2015-16 = 2 more than once 2016-17 = 2 more than once</p>

<p>12. Questioner's name: Cllr Suzanne Williams</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Kathy Williams</p>
<p>To: Cllr Kathy Williams</p> <p>Since the introduction of Electronic Call Monitoring in Learning Disabilities, how many times has it alerted this Council that domiciliary care are failing to attend a scheduled visit at a client's home?</p>	<p>In the initial phase of ECM introduction the responsibility has fallen to providers to monitor their own missed visits. This is for two reasons:</p> <p>The first is that their staff are lone working in the community and a missed visit may signify a health and safety issue for a care worker which may require timely intervention.</p> <p>The second reason is that the care provider holds the care plan for the individual and they will know whether the service user requires immediate attention for such things as prompting with medications.</p> <p>Missed visits are then routinely reviewed with providers at regular intervals and are used as a measure of the quality of service provided.</p>
<p>13. Questioner's name: Cllr Suzanne Williams</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p>
<p>To: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p> <p>Based on findings from Carers UK's State of Caring Survey 2016, many do not see themselves as a carer, and are therefore unlikely to consider asking for a carer's assessment, apply for Carer's Allowance or simply seek advice, please can the Cabinet Member tell me what work is being undertaken by this Council with other agencies in identifying those who are carrying out a caring role?</p>	<p>Improving the quality of life of carers is our locally agreed aspiration within the Better Care Fund across health and social care. The Council commissions Carers Gloucestershire to provide a range of carer related services to include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive Caring, • Personal/flexible budgets • Information, advice and guidance service • Support planning and carers assessment service • Carers Voice Service • Positive Caring <p>The Council provides funding to support safety, health, wellbeing, participation, attainment, personal and social development of young carers as young people.</p>

	<p>In addition the Council also has a number of Service Level Agreements in relation to carers with BME voluntary organisations to include Chinese Community Association, Chinese Women’s Guild and African Caribbean (Black Elders).</p> <p>Many carers self-refer having seen Carers Gloucestershire’s literature or posters/information stands – information stands are regularly placed in acute hospitals and other venues across the county. Carers also hear about services via word of mouth or community based support groups.</p> <p>General Practitioners have responsibility to identify carers, hold practice based registers of carers and signpost as above/ support individuals via another pathway such as social prescribing.</p> <p>The Integrated Care Teams (ICTs) across all localities are commissioned to identify carers and signpost as appropriate to organisations as above or connect them to local community based groups/initiatives.</p> <p>Beyond ICTs Community Connectors work closely with local residents and part of their remit is to identify carers, offer support and signpost as above.</p> <p>The national strategy for carers is due to be published this year. The Council fully recognises the essential role carers provide and is currently undertaking a review of all its carer related commissioning to develop a comprehensive local strategy that meets the needs of carers.</p>
<p>14. Questioner’s name: Cllr Suzanne Williams</p>	<p>Respondent’s name: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p>
<p>To: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p> <p>Employers can help identify those in the workplace with a caring role, please can the Cabinet Member tell me what this Council is doing to help identify and support those who are carrying out a</p>	<p>GCC has several employee-led networks, including a Carers network, which promote equality and help to eliminate discrimination. Information on the network is available via staffnet. The staffnet site also provides information and links to other local and national carers organisations.</p>

<p>caring role amongst its own workforce?</p>	<p>We have in place a number of supportive flexible working policies and procedures which are actively implemented across the organisation. Our 24 hour Employee Assistance helpline and linked website is available for all employees which provides support on a whole range of concerns that a carer may have such as financial and legal advice, counselling support and guidance on relationships and families.</p> <p>We do not record data on Carers centrally, however managers may know of those with caring responsibilities locally and provide support as required to individuals.</p>
<p>15. Questioner's name: Cllr Joe Harris</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Paul McLain</p>
<p>To: Cllr Paul McLain</p> <p>How many children in County Council primary schools would gain additional funding under the Government's proposed New Funding Formula for schools and how many will lose?</p>	<p>We understand that 50.3% of primary pupils are in schools that lose under the National Funding Formula, 48.4% are in schools that gain under it, and 1.3% are in schools that will see no change.</p>
<p>16. Questioner's name: Cllr Iain Dobie</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p>
<p>To: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p> <p>David Hodge, Conservative leader of Surrey Council, got a "sweetheart deal" out of the Government which will allow it to be first in retaining 100% of business rates. Will the Leader of this Council be speaking to the local government minister to get Gloucestershire a special deal too?</p>	<p>The Government has been very clear that there have been no special deals. I do draw Cllr Dobie's attention to the recently announced additional funding for adult social care. Gloucestershire, with a population of 617,000 people, received £21,342,279 or £34.59 per resident. Surrey, with a population of 1,169,000 people, received £21,044,359, or £18.00 per resident. Under my leadership, this council will continue its practice of quiet, tactful and effective lobbying, to secure the best deal for local residents.</p>

<p>17. Questioner's name: Cllr Ian Dobie</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p>
<p>To: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p> <p>What plans are being put in place this financial year to ensure a higher percentage of older people receive a full assessment of their social care needs within 12 months?</p>	<p>The Adult Social Care team is working with our Health teams to ensure we capture the information around individuals needs, as both Health and Social Care are, at times, working with the same people.</p> <p>Adult Social Care have ensured they have allocated staff in each locality that will focus on this task.</p>
<p>18. Questioner's name: Cllr Paul Hodgkinson</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p>
<p>To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p> <p>Please can the Cabinet Member tell me exactly how much the Javelin Park contract with UBB is likely to save this Council over 25 years and when would these savings start showing?</p>	<p>The project will save over £100 million and is forecast to produce significant savings within the first five years (<i>this is all set out in the November 2015 Exempt Annex</i>)</p>
<p>19. Questioner's name: Cllr Paul Hodgkinson</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p>
<p>To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p> <p>Please can the Cabinet Member explain in what ways this Council will increase recycling rates across the county once the Javelin Park incinerator is in operation?</p>	<p>As Cllr Hodgkinson will be aware, recycling is a district council responsibility, although one which the county council is deeply interested in. As he will have seen from the public questions, improvements in Stroud are very positive news, although they only bring the district in line with the rest of the county. We will keep working through the Joint Waste Committee, in partnership with Gloucestershire's district councils, to increase recycling and cut waste arisings wherever possible.</p>

<p>20. Questioner's name: Cllr Paul Hodgkinson</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p>
<p>To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p> <p>Please can the Cabinet Member provide me with a detailed explanation of how the projected figures for the county's total waste arisings over the length of the incinerator contract was devised?</p>	<p>The Waste Core Strategy sets out the council's predictions for waste arisings. This was agreed by all parties on this council, having been subject to a public inquiry chaired by an independent inspector, which examined this issue in considerable detail. The report and the evidence base behind it are published on the council's website, and provide considerable detail.</p>
<p>21. Questioner's name: Cllr Paul Hodgkinson</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p>
<p>To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p> <p>Please can the Cabinet Member tell me how and where the toxic ash from the Javelin Park will be disposed?</p>	<p>I assume Cllr Hodgkinson is referring to the Air Pollution Control Residues ("fly ash")? This is not classed as toxic – although it is hazardous, because it contains lime. As set out in the published contract approximately 5,000 tonnes per annum will be sent to a hazardous waste site in Northamptonshire. UBB continue to investigate alternative options for reuse of this material.</p>
<p>22. Questioner's name: Cllr Tim Harman</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>To: Cllr Vernon Smith</p> <p>Talbot Road in my Division is a Cul de Sac with Access onto the busy Lansdown Road. Problems already exist with at the junction with regard to the timing of the Pedestrian Crossing and cars ignoring the restrictions on turning from Talbot Road and Christchurch Road. The site of the former Police Headquarters is likely to be redeveloped which may exacerbate the situation.</p> <p>Will the Cabinet Member agree to a review of the junction, notwithstanding the outcome of the planning application, to improve Safety .</p>	<p>Yes, I am very happy to ask officers to review this.</p>

<p>23. Questioner's name: Cllr Barry Kirby</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>To: Cllr Nigel Moor</p> <p>Will the Cabinet member give me details of much revenue has been raised from the additional costs placed park and ride users, please break your response down by each park and ride site.</p>	<p>In 2015/16 free travel for concessionary bus pass holders on park and rides cost the council £222k.</p> <p>The £1 fare introduced on 1/4/16 for concessionary card holders to use the park and ride services is expected to save £144k during the current year: £67k at Arle Court plus £77k in reduced payments to Stagecoach for the services they provide at the Racecourse and Waterwells Park and Ride sites.</p>
<p>24. Questioner's name: Cllr Barry Kirby</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>To: Cllr Nigel Moor</p> <p>When will members get the opportunity to scrutinise both the County Council, and the OPCC's business case around the proposed transferring of the GFRS to the OPCC?</p>	<p>In the OPCC Chief Executive report he has annotated an indicative timeline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business Case preparation April – July 2017 • Consultation process August – September 2017 • Outline Business Case submitted to the Home Office October 2017. <p>I expect the county council's report to be available some time in May.</p>
<p>25. Questioner's name: Cllr Barry Kirby</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p>
<p>To: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p> <p>The Leader of the council said to me at the last Council meeting that "there was no special deal for Surrey" and that "from the people I have spoken to there was no deal for Surrey". In light of recent recordings from Surrey Conservative's group meeting confirming there was a "gentlemen's agreement' with the government over adult social care, would the Leader like to alter his reply?</p>	<p>I have no greater insight into the doings of Surrey County Council than Cllr Kirby, so cannot add to my previous answer. I do, however, draw Cllr Kirby's attention to the figures in my answer to question 16. I continue to believe Gloucestershire is well served by tactful and effective lobbying.</p>

<p>26. Questioner's name: Cllr Paul McMahon</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p>
<p>To: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p> <p>We are all thankful to officers and Cleeve Link workers who stepped up to the plate after what happened. Did the Cabinet member consider whether to bring this service in house during this process?</p>	<p>Certainly we considered all options open to us.</p>
<p>27. Questioner's name: Cllr Paul McMahon</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p>
<p>To: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p> <p>What level of scrutiny will be developed in the future to monitor contracts when service providers change?</p>	<p>Processes already exist for robust due diligence should there be a formal change of service provider. Recent experience has shown that when shareholders change, and thus technically the provider has stayed the same and hence our processes wouldn't apply, there can still be a risk due to the new ownership arrangements. Accordingly we will seek to strengthen our authority in these circumstances as part of the planned contract review this year.</p>
<p>28. Questioner's name: Cllr Steve Lydon</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p>
<p>To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p> <p>Could the Cabinet member please tell me what funding has been removed from the LEP, either by us or by government in the last year, or planned to be taken away in the next financial year?</p>	<p>No Government or Council funds, held by GCC as the Accountable Body, have been removed during the last year (16/17) or are planned for removal during the next financial year (17/18). In terms of other Government funding received directly by GFirst LEP this is a question you will have to ask them and I suggest you contact their chief executive.</p>

<p>29. Questioner's name: Cllr Graham Morgan</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>To: Cllr Paul McLain/ Cllr Nigel Moor/ Cllr Vernon Smith</p> <p>Will the County Council when redeveloping the Old St Whites School Cinderford, take the opportunity to deliver an obligation that was part of the Planning Application for the New St Whites School, that is in the interests of children's safety create a parents drop off area within that redevelopment, and take the unique opportunity to widen the mouth of Buckshaft Road at its junction with St Whites road?</p>	<p>The site is being looked at with a transport consultant and an architect to determine what options might be possible.</p>
<p>30. Questioner's name: Cllr Brian Oosthuysen</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p>
<p>To: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p> <p>A recent survey of NHS commissioners showed that 52% of STP regional plans include closing or downgrading a community hospital, 46% plans include reducing the number of hospital beds, 31% plan to close or downgrade A&E departments and 23% plan to end provision for children in one or more hospitals. Will there be a comparative reduction in public health and are there any plans in Gloucestershire for such reductions?</p>	<p>Public Health is not covered by the STP. Cllr Gravells is the cabinet member responsible for public health.</p>
<p>31. Questioner's name: Cllr Lesley Williams</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>To: Cllr Nigel Moor</p> <p>Will the Cabinet member please update me on the latest news regarding the Stonehouse Cable?</p>	<p>Following site meetings with local representatives, we have identified some potential alternative route options, and have asked UBB and Western Power Distribution to review the feasibility of those options. We will keep the local community informed once we have determined the choice of route, and will endeavour to minimise the disruption caused on whichever route is selected.</p>

<p>32. Questioner's name: Cllr Lesley Williams</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>To: Cllr Nigel Moor</p> <p>How quickly can a TRO can be put in place on Stonehouse high street to prevent people getting unnecessary parking tickets?</p>	<p>This year, for the second year running, we have added £100k to the highways budget for the delivery of Traffic Regulation Orders. Members will be invited to put forward proposals and schemes will be assessed and priority given to schemes that support our transport and road safety objectives and offer value for money.</p> <p>Before any changes can be made to parking restrictions the council must by law carry out a public consultation and follow a set legal process. This normally takes about nine months however where there are objections it normally takes longer and may result in a scheme not proceeding.</p>
<p>33. Questioner's name: Cllr Lesley Williams</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>To: Cllr Nigel Moor</p> <p>What measures can be put in place so that land owners recognise their responsibility to keep their ditches and dykes clear thus preventing local flooding?</p>	<p>A number of measures are already in place to help ensure landowners recognise their responsibility for keeping watercourses on their land clear of obstruction and reduce the risk from flooding. These include;</p> <p>Enforcement of the Land Drainage Act 1991. This act provides permissive powers to serve notice on landowners requiring them to carry out work to clear watercourses on their land. There are also permissive powers for the local authority to undertake essential clearance of watercourses on private land and to recharge the associated costs to the relevant landowner. The County Council has agreements in place and provides funding for each of 5 of the 6 Districts to enable them to discharge these powers on our behalf as and when required. In the Gloucester City administrative district the County Council discharges these powers directly as there is no agreement in place with that Council. The use of informal enforcement is the preferred approach initially and satisfactory outcomes are usually reached without recourse to issuing formal</p>

	<p>notices.</p> <p>Communication with landowners and communities. The County Council's Flood Risk Management team issues letters and batches of leaflets to all Parish and Town Councils at least once per year and included with this is an offer for an officer visit and presentation on flood risk management generally and the importance of maintaining watercourses. When this offer is taken up we take the opportunity to provide maps showing local watercourses and contact details to acquire further information. The aim of this is to enable Parish or Town Councillors and local volunteers to be proactive in their area to monitor watercourses, encourage landowners to undertake maintenance and report problems that require enforcement action. The Council's website contains further information on maintaining watercourses including current versions of the Council's Local Flood Risk Management Strategy. A press release is issued annually around late autumn after leaf fall to remind landowners of their responsibilities and request that they check on the condition of water courses and take action to clear them out.</p> <p>If councillors are aware of specific concerns, I am very happy to raise them with officers for them.</p>
<p>34. Questioner's name: Cllr Iain Dobie</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p>
<p>To: Cllr Kathy Williams</p> <p>How will Gloucestershire's social care budget for FY 17 - 18 be amended to reflect the additional funding as recently announced in the Spring Budget?</p>	<p>The Council has been advised that it will receive a one off sum of £10.598 million in 2017/18 but as yet the conditions related to this funding have not yet been received, although we have been advised that conditions will apply, so how this will change planned expenditure cannot yet be stated.</p>
<p>35. Questioner's name: Cllr Klara Sudbury</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p>
<p>To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p>	<p>I would not.</p>

Would the cabinet member agree with me that extra investment in social care recently added during the spring budget shows a belated recognition of how wrong the government were not to announce any extra funding as part of the local government finance settlement?	
36. Questioner's name: Cllr Klara Sudbury	Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou
To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou Should the social care provided for the most vulnerable members of our community be dependent on funding provided by last minute, panic driven U Turns by our Tory government?	I can't recall Cllr Sudbury raising any concerns about the adequacy of our social care funding when the Liberal Democrats were in coalition. I can recall her, and her party, opposing very many of the savings that this council made in a variety of areas so that we could protect social care funding.
37. Questioner's name: Cllr Klara Sudbury	Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne
To: Cllr Mark Hawthorne Does the council leader believe the financial black hole created by Brexit and the impact it will have on our much loved NHS and vital care services is a sacrifice worth making to settle an internal dispute within the Tory party?	NHS funding in Gloucestershire is scheduled to increase by over £73m in the coming years as a result of this Conservative government. I prefer that fact to baseless scaremongering.
38. Questioner's name: Cllr Lesley Williams	Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou
To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou In view of the incinerator contract being made public by accident, what efforts has the administration made to protect data and information?	When we were informed of the vulnerability, officers took immediate action and all documents posted on the council's disclosure log were reviewed and recreated to prevent unauthorised disclosure in the future.
39. Questioner's name: Cllr Lesley Williams	Respondent's name: Cllr Dorcas Binns
To: Cllr Dorcas Binns	We won't have a clear figure for some time – but we have significant reserves put aside to ensure that no-one misses the care they need.

<p>How much additional funding has GCC given to either Cleeve Link or Cleeve Link employees since it was announced they were going into liquidation?</p>	
<p>40. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p>
<p>To: Mark Hawthorne</p> <p>How have businesses in the city of Gloucester benefited from your trip to China?</p>	<p>Prospect Training, based in Quedgeley, was one of the 4 businesses that accompanied us on the visit to China. As well as continuing active discussions with Chinese counterparts Prospect Training launched an on line coaching suite in China this month. It is good to see Gloucester businesses like Prospect Training taking up the opportunity to export high quality products and services to the Chinese market.</p> <p>Furthermore much of the return visit by the Chinese delegation focused on Gloucester and significant investment opportunities continue to be explored as a result.</p>
<p>41. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p>
<p>To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p> <p>Could you please explain what the following refers to within the incinerator contract between UBB and GCC?</p> <p>Base Price Per Tonne Price Band (1) Price Band (2) Price Band (3)</p>	<p>I would refer you to Appendix 1 of Schedule 4 of the published contract which sets out the maximum values for each of the items stated in each year of the contract Band 1 includes an element of fixed costs of the facility. To calculate the Real average Gate Fee you need to calculate the weighted average of the tonnage relevant to each band and in addition account for the fact that Band 1 is not inflated.</p>
<p>42. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p>
<p>To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p>	<p>We expect around 2,000 tonnes per annum – it will be dealt with appropriately depending on the type of material.</p>

How many tonnes of unacceptable waste is the incinerator at Javelin Park expected to receive and how will this be dealt with?																
43. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou															
<p>To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p> <p>Could you confirm how many people are/were employed (full-time equivalent) by Gloucestershire County Council on the following dates?</p> <p>January 2005 January 2009 January 2013 January 2017</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Headcount</th> <th>FTE</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1st April 2007</td> <td>5136</td> <td>4083.63</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1st April 2009</td> <td>5456</td> <td>4143.70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1st April 2013</td> <td>3320</td> <td>2759.37</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1st January 2017</td> <td>3167</td> <td>2682.95</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Note: Data is not held before 2007. Figures exclude Fire & Rescue Service, all schools staff and casual staff.</p>	Year	Headcount	FTE	1 st April 2007	5136	4083.63	1 st April 2009	5456	4143.70	1 st April 2013	3320	2759.37	1 st January 2017	3167	2682.95
Year	Headcount	FTE														
1 st April 2007	5136	4083.63														
1 st April 2009	5456	4143.70														
1 st April 2013	3320	2759.37														
1 st January 2017	3167	2682.95														
44. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou															
<p>To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p> <p>Could you please confirm the value of redundancy payments made by this council over the following financial years?</p> <p>2013/14 2014/15 2015/16 2016/17</p>	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>2013/14</td> <td>£3,711,109</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2014/15</td> <td>£1,091,751</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015/16</td> <td>£1,907,539</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2016/17</td> <td>The data is unavailable as the financial year is not yet finished.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2013/14	£3,711,109	2014/15	£1,091,751	2015/16	£1,907,539	2016/17	The data is unavailable as the financial year is not yet finished.							
2013/14	£3,711,109															
2014/15	£1,091,751															
2015/16	£1,907,539															
2016/17	The data is unavailable as the financial year is not yet finished.															
45. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Respondent's name: Cllr Dorcas Binns															
<p>To: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p> <p>Please provide a list of home care charges on care packages for services provided to individuals by this council?</p>	<p>No contribution - 2050 (48.91%) of service users Some contribution – 1994 (47.58%) of service users Full contribution – 147 (3.51%) of service users</p>															

46. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Respondent's name: Cllr Dorcas Binns																		
<p>To: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p> <p>Please provide same information as to the previous question but for the following financial years?</p> <p>2013/14 2014/15 2015/16</p>	<p>2014-2015</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Full Contribution</td> <td>454</td> <td>7.74%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Some Contribution</td> <td>3768</td> <td>64.25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No Contribution</td> <td>1643</td> <td>28.01%</td> </tr> </table> <p>2015-2016</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Full Contribution</td> <td>293</td> <td>4.85%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Some Contribution</td> <td>3153</td> <td>52.15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No Contribution</td> <td>2600</td> <td>43.00%</td> </tr> </table> <p>Figures are not immediately available for 2013/14.</p>	Full Contribution	454	7.74%	Some Contribution	3768	64.25%	No Contribution	1643	28.01%	Full Contribution	293	4.85%	Some Contribution	3153	52.15%	No Contribution	2600	43.00%
Full Contribution	454	7.74%																	
Some Contribution	3768	64.25%																	
No Contribution	1643	28.01%																	
Full Contribution	293	4.85%																	
Some Contribution	3153	52.15%																	
No Contribution	2600	43.00%																	
47. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Respondent's name: Cllr Paul McLain																		
<p>To: Cllr Paul McLain</p> <p>What planning is this council doing to ensure there are adequate school places available to meet the demand as homes are built in central Gloucestershire as proposed by the Joint Core Strategy?</p>	<p>The council has a strong track record of effective school place planning to meet rising demand.</p> <p>We will be entering into s106 agreements for developers to provide the educational infrastructure required to meet the additional demand for places – this will include developers building a number of new primary and secondary schools, but also making financial contributions to enable existing schools to expand where necessary.</p> <p>Plans are well under way and a number of schemes to increase capacity are in the advanced stages.</p>																		

48. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor
<p>To: Cllr Nigel Moor</p> <p>How many female firefighters does Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service employ (numbers and percentages)?</p>	<p>The current position in Gloucestershire for all staff is that there are 17% (79) females including 12% (56) female firefighters. This compares favourably with national statistics which indicate only 5% of firefighters are female – although clearly there is still more work to be done here.</p>
49. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor
<p>To: Cllr Nigel Moor</p> <p>How many Black and Ethnic Minority firefighters does Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service employ (numbers and percentages)?</p>	<p>Of the total number of firefighters, 2.46% (10) are from black and ethnic minority backgrounds.</p>
50. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor
<p>To: Cllr Nigel Moor</p> <p>The Police and Crime Commissioner has been given £100K to mount a bid to takeover the governance of our Fire and Rescue Service.</p> <p>He has appointed PA Consultants of Buckingham Palace Road, London to prepare a business case.</p> <p>How do you feel about this development?</p>	<p>I look forward to seeing the outcome, which I believe will demonstrate how our Fire and Rescue Service runs well under the county council.</p>

<p>51. Questioner's name: Cllr Iain Dobie</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p>
<p>To: Cllr Kathy Williams</p> <p>Does this extra central government funding mean that there will be no reduction to the overall GCC Social Care budget for FY 2017-18 when compared with FY 2016-17, or will the vulnerable still be hit with cuts?</p>	<p>I'm amazed that, one meeting after we set the budget, Cllr Dobie would suggest that there has been any reduction in our social care budget. The budget approved by Council last month increased Adult Social Care by over £4.3m. Our budget for social care has not been cut, it has increased.</p>
<p>52. Questioner's name: Cllr Richard Leppington</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>The Forest of Dean needs a bus network that is consistently delivering passenger journeys without delays and breakdowns. Further to the question that I asked at the last Council meeting, I have received detailed information on the number of breakdowns on services run by Stagecoach. It is clear that there are serious problems that need to be addressed. Can I formally request that Cllr Nigel Moor, the Cabinet Member responsible for buses, arrange a meeting with myself and the Stagecoach Operations Manager for the Forest of Dean to discuss the ongoing issues with a view to agreeing an action plan to resolve the problems?</p>	<p>The issue of bus breakdowns is a popular one in my postbag. However they principally relate to Stagecoach's commercial network for which the county council has no responsibility. However, I have arranged a meeting with the Operations Manager and Engineering Manager, along with Cllr Leppington, for 5th April. Unfortunately I now understand that Cllr Leppington has another meeting to attend at the Forest of Dean District Council but is content that the meeting goes ahead on that date.</p>
<p>53. Questioner's name: Cllr Steve Lydon</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p>
<p>To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p> <p>At the latest Police and Crime Panel the Chairman stated that if the PCC were to back down on his threat to leave the RSP, the Council would return its recent investment in the Partnership to the reserves. Could the Cabinet clarify whether this is the intention of the administration?</p>	<p>I understand that we continue to correspond with the PCC on this subject. The council will, of course, review the situation once the issue has been fully clarified.</p>

<p>54. Questioner's name: Cllr Steve Lydon</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p>
<p>To: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p> <p>What levels of coverage has the Council achieved under Fastershire since it was started, and what final coverage would the Council expect to achieve?</p>	<p>To date, approximately 90.6% of the County has been enabled with NGA broadband (30mbps or above). This figure also reflects the commercial investment by market providers and is not solely attributed to the work of Fastershire Stages 1 & 2.</p> <p>Fastershire Stage 3 is just commencing with a final coverage target of 97% of Gloucestershire premises due to be enabled by the end of 2018.</p>
<p>55. Questioner's name: Cllr Steve Lydon</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>How many residents have taken up the 'Big Switch' in the County and whose responsibility has it been in the Council to run it?</p>	<p>5,904 individuals have registered under 'The Big Community Switch, of which 1,264 have taken up the offer to switch their energy provider.</p>
<p>56. Questioner's name: Cllr Barry Kirby</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Paul McLain</p>
<p>To: Cllr Paul McLain</p> <p>I have recently been contacted by a resident who has having the hardest of times securing the best services for their child with SEND. It appears that she has been treated without respect or compassion and it appears that their case is going to tribunal. What are we doing, as a Council, to build trust in the way that we work with parents?</p>	<p>Officers work hard to establish trusting relationships with parents and work collaboratively to get the best outcomes for children, with an increased focus on co-production at both a strategic and at an individual child level - the success of which was reflected in the SEND Ofsted outcome last year.</p> <p>There is a strong working relationship with parent carer groups which is extremely effective in sharing the challenges of working within a heavily regulated area and developing joint strategies for responding to these – developing positive relationships remains a joint priority for the Council and the parent carer networks.</p> <p>Inevitably there will always be a minority of cases where educational professionals take a different view to parents on how to achieve the best outcomes for children. In such situations it is quite correct that parents should have the option to exercise their legal right for their</p>

	child's case to be heard by the independent tribunal service.
57. Questioner's name: Cllr Barry Kirby	Respondent's name: Cllr Paul McLain
<p>To: Cllr Paul McLain</p> <p>What is the current relationship between Baker Small and the Council regarding ongoing and upcoming cases?</p>	<p>The Council's contract with Baker Small Solicitors expires next year. Their contract includes working with partners across Gloucestershire to improve SEND systems and processes to reduce the number of tribunal hearing.</p> <p>Work is ongoing to further reduce the need for external legal support and alternative options for the future are being put in place.</p> <p>Consequently we are seeing an on-going reduction in the number of cases going to tribunal due to increased co-production and strong partnership working with families. In the small number of cases where educational professionals have a different view from parents about how to achieve the best educational outcomes, the need for external legal support has also reduced as officers become more skilled in the legal aspects of SEND and are able to effectively represent the Council in tribunal situations.</p>
58. Questioner's name: Cllr Sarah Lunnon	Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou
<p>To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p> <p>Having looked at the contract between GCC and UBB, calculations indicate that cancellation will cost up to £36 million and possibly less. Will the Council release its calculations, and those undertaken on its behalf by Ernst and Young, which arrived at the figure of £100 million?</p>	<p>The costs for cancellation set out in the contract do not include the others costs the council would have to bear, including financing costs, extra waste disposal costs, and re-procurement costs.</p> <p>EY's calculations would form the basis of our negotiating and legal position were the contract to be terminated and as such must remain exempt at present. The information tribunal agreed with this position.</p>

<p>59. Questioner's name: Cllr Sarah Lunnon</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p>
<p>To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p> <p>Why when GCC and UBB had an agreed schedule listing information considered confidential did it seek to with-hold and indeed redact much greater detail?</p>	<p>I refer Cllr Lunnon to the answer to public question 7.</p>
<p>60. Questioner's name: Cllr Sarah Lunnon</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p>
<p>To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p> <p>Will GCC provide a briefing to Councillors on the breach which led to GCC's contract with UBB being available in an insecure form on its own website?</p>	<p>I am sure the Monitoring Officer, who is responsible for this, would be happy to discuss the issue with any interested councillors.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank